



International Journal of Cultural Policy

Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information:

<http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/gcul20>

Cultural identity and cultural policy in South Korea

Haksoon Yim ^a

^a Korea Culture and Contents Agency , Seoul, South Korea

Published online: 17 Sep 2010.

To cite this article: Haksoon Yim (2002) Cultural identity and cultural policy in South Korea, International Journal of Cultural Policy, 8:1, 37-48

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10286630290032422>

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Taylor & Francis makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of all the information (the "Content") contained in the publications on our platform. However, Taylor & Francis, our agents, and our licensors make no representations or warranties whatsoever as to the accuracy, completeness, or suitability for any purpose of the Content. Any opinions and views expressed in this publication are the opinions and views of the authors, and are not the views of or endorsed by Taylor & Francis. The accuracy of the Content should not be relied upon and should be independently verified with primary sources of information. Taylor and Francis shall not be liable for any losses, actions, claims, proceedings, demands, costs, expenses, damages, and other liabilities whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with, in relation to or arising out of the use of the Content.

This article may be used for research, teaching, and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, redistribution, reselling, loan, sub-licensing, systematic supply, or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden. Terms & Conditions of access and use can be found at <http://www.tandfonline.com/page/terms-and-conditions>

CULTURAL IDENTITY AND CULTURAL POLICY IN SOUTH KOREA

Haksoon Yim*

Korea Culture and Contents Agency, Seoul, South Korea

INTRODUCTION

WITH THE evolution of cultural policy in South Korea, there has been an associated change in cultural policy objectives, these being primarily concerned with establishing cultural identity, the development of culture and the arts, the promotion of the quality of cultural life and the fostering of cultural industries. However, as a whole, since the establishment of the first republic of 1948, the foremost challenge of Korean cultural policy has been to resolve the issue of cultural identity. As Yersu Kim (1976, 10–12) observes, until the late 1970s, the construction of cultural identity provided perhaps the most significant rationale for cultural policy. With regard to this characteristic of Korean cultural policy, it is instructive to identify why the issue of cultural identity has been considered important, and furthermore, to what extent this issue has actually affected cultural policy.

This article, then is concerned with the relationship between cultural identity and cultural policy. Indeed, within many countries, the issue of cultural identity has been considered as a cultural policy objective (Council of Europe, 1997, 45–46; Bradley, 1998, 351–367; Burgi-Golub, 2000, 211–223). Issues of multiculturalism, cultural diversity and cultural globalization are all closely bound up with the issue of cultural identity (Jong, 1998, 357–387; Held *et al.*, 1999, 328–375; Tomlinson, 1999; Bauer, 2000, 77–95).

However, the characteristics and causes of the issue of cultural identity vary, depending on the characteristics of the countries in which cultural identity is formulated and transformed. These differences might thus affect the way that government deals with the issue of cultural identity. In addition, as cultural policy in any given country tends to shift according to changes in the various contexts of cultural policy (Bennett, 1995, 199–216; Kim, 1999, 1–19;

*Address: 5F Hyundai Dream Tower, P23-14 Mokdony, Vangchungu, Seoul, South Korea 158-050. E-mail: hsyim7@hotmail.com

Wyszomirski, 1999, 187–197), cultural identity policy might be seen to differ at different stages of cultural policy.

This article will focus particularly on how the Korean government has sought to deal with the issue of cultural identity through the evolution of cultural policy. Firstly, the primary causes of the issue of cultural identity will be identified in the light of cultural policy. Subsequently, this article will discuss how the issue of cultural identity has affected cultural policy. In addressing these issues, the article seeks to identify the distinctive characteristics of Korean cultural policy and how the government itself has justified its policy objectives through the evolution of its cultural policy. In doing so, the article will consider those policy objectives stated in the comprehensive plans for cultural policy, as established by the government since 1973. In addition, the article considers the cultural policy programs and the content of formal speeches made by the presidents.

THE ISSUE OF CULTURAL IDENTITY IN SOUTH KOREA

The issue of cultural identity first arose from the sense of cultural discontinuity between Korean traditional culture and contemporary culture, owing to the influence of Japanese colonialism (1910–1945), the divided Korea (1945–present), the Korean War (1950–1953), rapid modernization and the apparently indiscriminate influx of western culture. Given these various circumstances, Korean traditional culture has tended to become eroded and swiftly transformed, and furthermore, to some extent, has given way to western culture in terms of the way of life of the people.

Thus, in order to identify what causes the issue of cultural identity to be so central to cultural policy, it is necessary to mention first the characteristics of Korean traditional culture. One of Korea's most striking characteristics has been its long and continuous existence as a unified country. In spite of numerous invasions and occupations, the Koreans have remained remarkably homogeneous, and have been termed *Han minjok* (meaning “Korean nation”). Furthermore, despite Korea being divided, the national consciousness constructed by *Han minjok* has remained. As Eckert *et al.* (1990, 407) point out, this characteristic has become an essential basis for modern Korean nationalism, developing as it did in reaction to foreign imperialism and occupation during the late 19th and 20th centuries. This cultural nationalism has indeed provided a significant background to Korean cultural identity policy. It is for this reason that multiculturalism based on various ethnic groups need not be considered in Korean cultural policy.

On the other hand, it is important to consider traditional culture and the strength of influence of Confucianism, the ruling ideology of the Chosun dynasty (1392–1910). Due to the influence of Confucianism, the Chosun dynasty emphasized humanity, ethical morality and spiritual self-cultivation, and furthermore, valued spiritual over material life. Other values of Confucianism such as virtue, harmony, faithfulness, propriety, righteousness and loyalty were also considered to be important during the Chosun dynasty (See Baoyun (1998) for Confucianism). In line with this, spiritual culture and academic knowledge were broadly preferred to commerce and technology. The arts have thus come to be seen as an integral part of cultivating morality.

These characteristics of traditional culture have been eroded, and furthermore separated from contemporary culture, owing to the following factors.

Firstly, the problem of cultural identity is caused by the experience of Japanese colonialism, which sought to eradicate and distort Korean cultural identity by the enforcement of a cultural assimilation policy at the end of the Japanese colonial period (Ki-baik Lee, 1984, 361–372). Indeed, the Japanese occupation may be said to have deprived Koreans of their chance of modernizing themselves beyond the traditional characteristics. Moreover, after liberation from Japan, the legacy of Japanese colonialism continued to influence the development of Korean culture in a negative way.

Secondly, as a result of the division since 1945, although the Korean people were ethnically and linguistically homogeneous before the division, the last 55 years have witnessed growing differences and heterogeneity between South and North Korea. These differences have taken place in the whole area of society, including language, culture and the arts. While South Korea was founded on the basis of democracy and capitalism, North Korea came to be dominated by the principle of communism and socialism. In North Korea, literature and the arts have been conceived of straightforwardly as a means of legitimating the Party's thought in North Korea. Artistic activities in North Korea are based on the North Korean brand of socialism called "Juche Thought" (meaning "self reliance"), which was developed for the purpose of legitimating the North Korean regime of the 1960s (National Unification Research Institute, 1994, 41–57; Oh Yang Yeol, 1998, 59–60). In this respect, North Korea continued to close its door towards arts based on capitalism and western democracy (National Unification Research Institute, 1994, 107–120). Under these cultural differences, the recovery of the cultural identity of the Korean nation has become a challenge of cultural policy.

Thirdly, western culture, which started to permeate Korean society since the late 19th century, has spread rapidly since the Korean War of 1950. In particular, throughout the process of modernization since 1960s, western popular culture based on capitalism and commercialism has swept the country, and as a result, has substantially affected the way of life of the people. While western culture permeated the everyday life of the people, the traditional characteristics of the Korean culture gradually lost their influence on the way of life of the people.

The problem is that the characteristics of the western culture differ considerably from that of Korean traditional culture. From the Korean point of view, it has been argued that western popular culture tends to be synonymous with commercialism, materialism, violence and sensuality as compared with the Korean traditional culture mentioned above. What was worse, the swift pace of modernization tended to increase extreme individualism and hedonism. Indeed, this trend led to a certain confusion and crisis within Korean cultural identity. Under these circumstances, one of the problems which cultural policy faced was to reshape Korean cultural identity and simultaneously, to lessen the negative impacts of the increasing inflow of western culture. Cultural policies have been one response to this problem.

Finally, it is important to appreciate the increasing globalization, due in many respects to the development of information technology and the cultural industries. As a result, the issue of cultural identity has been reasserted since the 1990s within South Korea. As Tomlinson (1999, 12–22) points out, culture is widely regarded as a key dimension to globalization. In many countries, cultural globalization is even transforming the context in which, and the means by which, national cultures are produced and reproduced (Held *et al.*, 1999, 328–375). However, it might be said that the practical impact of cultural globalization on national cultures and identities differs according to the nations in question. Inevitably, a cultural policy approach to contemporary cultural globalization varies from country to country.

As mentioned above, South Korea witnessed a negative impact from the inflow of western culture on national cultural identity. Due to the influence of this historical experience, there has been fear that contemporary cultural globalization based on uneven cultural flow between nations would threaten national cultural identity as well as domestic cultural industries. On the other hand, in contrast with the pressure for homogenization brought to bear by the globally orientated production and distribution of popular culture, it has been suggested that a distinctive cultural identity is likely to promote a sense of competitiveness within cultural industries in a global society. Indeed, these recognitions have all contributed to intensifying the need to strengthen cultural identity. As a result, from the middle of the 1990s, the establishment of cultural identity has been considered as an important policy issue in response to cultural globalization in South Korea.

CULTURAL POLICY AND THE ISSUE OF CULTURAL IDENTITY

Construction of Cultural Identity as a Cultural Policy Objective

With the development of Korean cultural policy, culture and the arts have come to be considered as an essential part of government policy. Despite an insufficient budget, the first republic (1948–1960) headed by president Rhee Syngman stressed the importance of national culture within state development. Thereafter, this recognition of the value of culture has continued to reverberate up to the current government of Kim Dae Jung and furthermore, has provided a significant rationale for government subsidy to the cultural sector. This perception is also closely associated with the characteristic of Korean traditional culture, which valued the spiritual, due to the influence of Confucianism.

During its 18-year reign (1961–1979), the government of Park Chung Hee, which placed priority on economic growth, launched cultural policy in an even more proactive way by establishing laws, institutions, organizations and public funds related to the cultural sector. In particular, in 1973, Park's government published “the first five-year master plan for cultural development” to be implemented during the period 1974–1979, which was the first comprehensive long-term plan for cultural policy. Even though excellence and access were seen to be the primary goals of cultural policy, a major priority objective of this plan was to establish a new cultural identity by highlighting a specific cultural tradition (Ministry of Culture and Information, 1973). For this reason, during the 1974–1978 period, 70% of the total public expenditure on the cultural sector was distributed into folk arts and traditional culture (Ministry of Culture and Information, 1979, 228).

The period of Chun Doo Hwan's government (from 1980 to 1988) may be labelled as a period of major growth in the role of the state in providing support for the arts in Korea. As with Park's government, the establishment of national cultural identity was given major emphasis during the fifth republic of Chun Doo Whan's government (Keong Hyang Newspaper Company, 1987, 220–223). However, in contrast to Park's government, during Chun's government, publicly subsidized culture was no longer limited merely to cultural heritage and traditional arts, rather, it was extended to contemporary arts and to the everyday life of the people. Chun's government published two comprehensive plans for cultural policy: “the new plan for cultural development” (1981) and “the cultural plan in the sixth five-year plan for economic and social development” (1986). According to these plans (Ministry of Culture and Information, 1981; 1986), the primary cultural policy objectives may be

characterized as follows: establishing cultural identity, promoting the excellence of the arts, improving cultural welfare, promoting regional culture, and expanding cultural exchange with other countries.

In 1990, the Roh Tae Woo government (1988–1993) established a “ten-year master plan for cultural development”, which coined the catch phrase: “culture for all the people”. The primary goals of these plans were as follows: (1) to establish cultural identity, (2) to promote the excellence of the arts, (3) to improve cultural welfare, (4) to promote regional culture, (5) to facilitate international cultural exchange, (6) to develop cultural media, and finally, to achieve ethnic reunification (Ministry of Culture, 1990). In particular, the promotion of regional culture, international exchange and cultural policy for unification were emphasized in relation to previous governments.

The government of Kim Young Sam (1993–1998) advocated the “Creation of the New Korea” as a political campaign slogan and sought to improve the status of Korea in global society (Young, 1995; 1996; 1997). For this reason, when compared to the former governments, the government of Kim Young Sam asserted cultural democracy, the creativity of the people, regional culture, cultural industries and cultural tourism, unification, and the globalization of Korean culture as being its main cultural policy objectives. The establishment of cultural identity was also seen to be a significant goal of cultural policy. In addition, Kim’s government came to emphasize the economic importance of culture and the arts. The “new five-year plan for promoting cultural development” (1993), “the master plan for cultural welfare” (1996), and “the cultural vision 2000” (1997) all highlighted these policy objectives (Ministry of Culture and Sports, 1993; 1996; 1997).

These objectives of cultural policy continued to be of importance during the government of Kim Dae Jung (1998– present). In particular, according to four comprehensive plans for cultural policy such as the plan for cultural policy of the new government (1998), the five-year plan for the development of cultural industries (1999), the vision 21 for cultural industries (2000a) and the vision 21 for cultural industries in a digital society (2001), the government of Kim Dae Jung stressed the promotion of cultural industries and cultural exchange with North Korea in comparison with the previous governments (Ministry of Culture and Tourism, 1998; 1999; 2000a; 2001). The “sunshine” policy towards North Korea led the government to develop proactive cultural policies for unification. Furthermore, the instrumental and exchange value of culture and the arts has provided a new rationale for cultural policy. In contrast with previous governments, the term cultural identity became a significant basis for government subsidy for fostering cultural industries.

Likewise, with the evolution of cultural policy in South Korea, ascertaining the specificity of cultural identity has been considered a priority for cultural policy. With regard to the issue of cultural identity, the focal concerns of cultural policy are concerned with the following questions: (1) What are the policy measures for recovering the cultural identity eroded by Japanese colonialism and ethnic division? (2) What policy measures are suitable for establishing cultural identity by lessening the negative aspects of foreign culture, in particular, western popular culture? (3) What are the policy measures for coping with increasing cultural globalization?

Cultural Policy Approach to the Issue of Cultural Identity

Close or Open-door Policy Towards Japanese Culture

Since the liberation of 1945, the recovery of cultural identity by removing the legacy of Japanese colonialism has been an essential part of cultural policy (The Ministry of Culture and

Information, 1979, 248). The government has sought to rebuild in effect, the eroded national culture by re-evaluating traditional culture and intensifying research and education on Japanese colonialism. In addition, before 1998, the government prohibited the performance or exhibition of Japanese culture and arts in Korea.

This closed-door policy towards Japanese culture and arts was largely caused by a negative attitude towards Japan as a whole, due to the Japanese occupation. In addition, the illegally distributed Japanese cultural products, generally thought to contain violent and pornographic materials, have reinforced this negative attitude. On the other hand, there was a fear that the Japanese cultural industries, with their substantial capital and technology, could threaten the domestic market share of Korean cultural industries.

Nonetheless, Kim Dae Jung's government began to perceive Japanese culture in a more positive way, in contrast to the negative stance of former governments. He stated that the promotion of cultural exchange with other nations, including Japan, was necessary for the development of national culture and the globalization of national culture (Dae Jung Kim, 1998). In practice, the current government started to open the door to Japanese film, video and publishing in 1998. The performing industry of Japan was subsequently permitted in 1999. After this, in 2000, animation, pop music, music recordings, games and broadcast programs from Japan were given approval (Ministry of Culture and Tourism, 2000b, 3–59). It might be said that this shift in cultural policy is a positive response to increasing cultural globalization.

Cultural Policy for Anti-communism and Reunification

Following their division, both Koreas sought to identify the historic roots of their legitimacy by emphasizing national culture. In doing so, the issue of cultural identity had been mobilized in the process of legitimacy competition between South and North Korea. On the other hand, anti-communism has been emphasized as a governing ideology of the state, in particular, during the period from first republic to the fifth. This emphasis on anti-communism became a rationale for the restriction on the freedom of artistic expression. As a result, until the late 1980s, cultural products based on communism were strictly regulated by the government. The cultural products which legitimated the regime in operation in North Korea, and produced in North Korea, were prohibited from being distributed in South Korea. Furthermore, there were inevitably few cultural exchanges between South and North Korea until the late 1980s.

Meanwhile, in contrast to the former republic, the sixth republic headed by the government of Rho Tae Woo gradually launched an open-door policy towards North Korean culture. The so-called “7.7 special declaration for unification” initialled by the government of Rho Tae Woo in 1988 was a watershed in the history of cultural policy for Northern Culture. The “7.7 special declaration” was based on the recognition that it was necessary to promote an exchange between the two Koreas in order for a Korean national community to be defined (The Ministry of Unification, 1997, 30).

Subsequently, in 1989, Rho's government published basic guidelines relating to exchange and cooperation with North Korea, and furthermore, published its “policy directions for unification of the Korean national community,” which stressed the importance of the recovery of trust and homogeneity between the two Koreas for unification. Hence, in 1990, a guideline on cultural exchange was established and the Act for Exchange and Cooperation with North Korea and the Act for Cooperation Fund were passed in South Korea. Moreover, as a result of

dialogue between the two Koreas, the Basic Agreement and the Specific Agreement on the Joint Committee for Mutual Cooperation were adopted in 1991 and 1992, respectively.

As a result, some elements of literature written by the North Koreans were permitted for the first time in South Korea. The range of permissions for North Korea's cultural products has gradually widened, even though it is still limited. Furthermore, cultural policy strategies for reunification were integrated into "the ten years master plan for cultural development" designed by the Ministry of Culture, 1990. Thereafter, all the master plans for cultural policy have contained cultural strategies for reunification.

In 1997, the government of Kim Young Sam sought to prepare cultural policy for the complex task of promoting cultural exchange. He endeavoured to achieve this by establishing legal guidelines regarding cooperation between socio-cultural programs. However, despite adopting an open-door policy towards North Korean culture since the late 1980s, few artistic exchange programs took place before 1998. It was not until the beginning of the current government of Kim Dae Jung in 1998 that cultural policy concerns for unification came to be distinctively pursued in a more practical way. The current president Kim Dae Jung went so far as to stress that the development of national culture as a unified nation was the cornerstone of peaceful reunification between South Korea and North Korea, in the sense that it contributed to overcome the heterogeneous culture, owing to the ethnic division (Dae Jung Kim, 1999).

Kim Dae Jung's government has sought to pursue a "sunshine policy" for North Korea. As a result, the "6.15 Agreement between the South and the North" was accomplished on June 15, 2000. This agreement emphasized in particular the exchange between the two Koreas in terms of the social, cultural and economic sectors. In practice, this agreement has led to the promotion of cultural exchange between South Korea and North Korea. The numbers of exchange programs between the South and the North increased considerably in the form of joint programs and mutual visiting programs of artistic works (The Ministry of Unification, 2000, 88–89). In addition, from 1998, the films produced by North Koreans were allowed to shown on TV in South Korea. Moreover, the arts events and projects related to unification have also been supported.

Consequently, given the influence of the division between South and North Korea, cultural policy has been mobilized as a tool for overcoming anti-communism, on one hand and for reunification, on the other. The cultural policy for unification has focused on the recovery of the cultural identity of one Korea and the promotion of cultural exchange between the two Koreas. On the other hand, cultural policy has also been considered as a channel to improve exchange and negotiations between South and North Korea.

Political Economy of Cultural Identity Policy

Throughout the 1960s and 1970s, the government's priority may be said to have been to achieve economic growth. For this reason, Park's regime sought an export-oriented industrialization strategy led by the government. This strategy necessitated many skilled and unskilled people, who were willing to work hard in spite of low wage and bad working conditions. Given these circumstances, culture and the arts, in particular, traditional culture was increasingly seen as the generating force behind the drive for modernization led by the government. In this sense, president Park called culture and education the "the Second Economy" (Chung Hee Park, 1968, 138). As a result, cultural policy became an indispensable part of economic policy. However, it should be noted that the value of culture as a motivation

factor is markedly different from the exchange value of culture, which has been a key rationale for cultural industry policy since the middle of the 1990s.

In order to identify a rationale for the popular mobilization required for economic policy, Park's government considered establishing cultural identity as a priority of cultural policy objectives by emphasizing traditional culture. In particular, the value of the spirit of self-help, self-dependence and self-reliance, diligence, frugality, cooperation and patriotism were stressed as a way of serving economic development. Therefore culture and the arts conducive to cultivating these values were publicly subsidized. Following Park's government, the government's perception of culture and the arts as a motivation factor for economic development has been maintained. However, in contrast to Park's government, which restricted its attention primarily traditional culture, the other governments have recognized the concept of culture in a much broader sense, including contemporary arts and popular culture. They advocated that governments should promote the creativity of the people, which is an important element of economic development in a knowledge-based information society.

Meanwhile, it was pointed out that Park's government tended to mobilize cultural policy in order to secure political legitimacy (National Unification Research Institute, 1994, 48, JaeHo, Chon 1998, 84–106). Park's regime took power by squashing the Second Republic via a military coup in 1961. Therefore, it was essential for Park to legitimize his political system. Moreover, the so-called *Yushin* Constitution of 1972 enacted by Park's regime was little more than a legal euphemism for institutionalizing Park's dictatorial rule. Park's government sought to attain the legitimacy of the *Yushin* Constitution by advocating Korean democracy within the political and socio-cultural context of Korea (National Unification Research Institute, 1994, 65).

As a consequence of this, Park's government sought to locate the greatness and excellence of Korean culture by shedding light on the national culture from a new perspective. Park's government sought to infuse a sense of patriotism into people by invoking the traditional characteristic of Korean culture, which emphasized loyalty and patriotism and cooperation. The cohesiveness of the people was pursued as a cultural policy objective. Consequently, during Park's regime, the establishment of Korean cultural identity as a policy objective was aimed at developing national culture on the one hand and on the other, was considered a strong instrument for the state-led economic development strategy and political legitimacy of Park's government.

Cultural Identity and Cultural Regulation

The establishment of cultural identity as a cultural policy objective has provided a significant basis for cultural regulation. As mentioned above, Japanese culture and North Korean culture have for a long time been included in the regulated cultural sector. Regulation of some western popular culture was based on the recognition that western popular culture could threaten the cultural tradition, which stressed the spiritual world, morality and abstinence. In addition, the term cultural identity has been used as a means of resisting the increase in cultural globalization.

Park's government differentiated "sound" culture from "unsound" culture. The term "soundness" was strategically used to enlighten and mobilize people for the political purpose of Park's government. Park's government sought to promote a "sound" culture conducive to anti-communism, nationalism, traditional morality and state-led economic development strategy.

On the other hand, this emphasis on the soundness of culture resulted in an increased emphasis on the public function of culture and the arts. This was thus liable to paralyse the critical thought of the people by providing a rationale for regulation of the so-called “unsound” culture. For example, until 1992, realistic art forms based on populism were unlikely to be supported by the government, since these sought to criticize the existing political regime and the negative aspects of industrialization while their intention was also to depict the rapid economic growth as working against democracy, human rights and social welfare.

Meanwhile, the government of Chun Doo Whan and Rho Tae Woo used “soundness” of culture as an important criterion for public support of the arts. However, from the government of Kim Young Sam, the scope of “unsound culture” has decreased rapidly and as a result, the breakdown between “sound” culture and “unsound” culture is no longer significant in cultural policy. Furthermore, overall, the cultural policy for establishing cultural identity has generally been shifted from regulation to deregulation over time.

Cultural Identity and Cultural Welfare

While the promotion of people’s participation in cultural life has been one of the key objectives of cultural policy since the 1970s, policy measures for this have been developed since the 1980s. This cultural welfare policy differs from the cultural policy of Chosun Confucian state, which was primarily restricted to the ruling class named *yangban* intellectuals.

Rapid economic growth since 1960s has affected cultural welfare policy in two different ways. On one hand, economic growth has led to an increase in cultural demand, which is a significant basis for cultural welfare policy. According to the Bank of Korea (2001), per capita GNP (current price) has sharply increased from US \$249 in 1970 to US \$9628 in 2000. Due to the influence of economic growth, the share of entertainment and culture expenditure of the total consumption expenditure in urban households increased from 1.9% in 1975 to 5.2% in 1997 (National Statistical Office, 2001).

On the other hand, since the 1980s, culture and the arts have been considered to be a solution to social problems. Governments have tended to attribute social problems to the deserted spiritual world and the confused ethics caused by rapid economic growth. Thus, the government has stressed that the enrichment of the spiritual world by culture and arts was necessary to counteract the negative effects of materialism and commercialism. This demonstrates that cultural policy has considered the moral mission of culture and the arts. Culture and the arts have been mobilized as a cement of social cohesion.

The increased policy concern for the quality of cultural life of the people was also associated with government efforts to establish cultural identity. From the 1980s, cultural policy employed to locate the roots of cultural identity has expanded from traditional culture and highbrow culture to popular culture and the cultural life of the people. The government has stressed self-identity and creativity on the part of the people as a solution to avoid the indiscriminate adoption of foreign culture. In other words, the government has stated that self-identity and creativity of the people should be an integral part of receiving foreign culture and maintaining the precious legacy of traditional culture. In connection with this, the government sought to promote self-identity and creativity of the people by improving the quality of the cultural life of the people. It is for this reason that cultural education programs have been intensified since 1990s. In short, the establishment of cultural identity has been considered as a rationale for cultural welfare policy.

Cultural Identity and Cultural Globalization

Successfully adjusting to cultural globalization due to advanced information technology and the increasing global flow of cultural commodities has been one challenge of cultural policy. Under such circumstances, the construction of cultural identity as a policy factor has been advocated as a rationale for government regulation as well as support for the cultural sector. In the process, to some extent, the term cultural identity tended to be mobilized as a shield for protecting domestic cultural industries under cultural globalization.

By regulating the distribution of foreign cultural products by a quota system in the field of cinema and broadcasting, government attempted to lessen the negative impact of globalization on Korean cultural identity and domestic cultural industries. A screen quota system has been maintained since 1966. Thus, film theatres have to show domestic films at least 106 days per year. Over 25% of the total hours of film broadcasting is supposed to be filled with domestic films. In addition, 30 to 50% of the total hours of animation broadcasting must be filled with domestic animation (Ministry of Culture and Tourism, 2000b, 308–329). The share of domestic films among the total film market in the Korea is about 36.1% in terms of the number of viewers, 35.8% in terms of ticket sales in 1999 (Ministry of Culture and Tourism, 2000b, 407–436).

However, on the other hand, from the late 1980s, the government has gradually opened its door to foreign cultural industries. From 1988, the importing of films and music records from foreign countries was formally permitted and foreign film companies were able to distribute their products directly within Korea. In addition, as mentioned above, the current government of Kim Dae Jung started to open the door to Japanese cultural industries from 1998.

Meanwhile, the construction of cultural identity has also been stressed as a significant rationale for fostering cultural industries and cultural exchange with other nations. Cultural identity has been regarded as an essential part of the competitiveness of the state within a global society. In particular, the 1986 Asian Games and 1988 Olympic Games gave important momentum to encouraging policy concerns for cultural identity from an international perspective. In addition, the globalization policy set in motion in 1995 by the government of Kim Young Sam required the government to reshape its cultural policy towards enhancement of international cultural exchange. Moreover, as local autonomy by elected public officials was introduced in 1995, the construction of cultural identity has been newly stressed as an integral element of regional development in a global society.

The current government of Kim Dae Jung has enhanced its support for cultural industries in a more positive way, with the express purpose of improving the international competitiveness of domestic cultural industries since the end of the 1990s. This government subsidy for cultural industries contrasts markedly with the regulation policy for the cultural industry sector throughout the 1970s and 1980s. Fostering cultural industry policy is based primarily on the economic value of the cultural industries. The current president Kim Dae Jung has indeed emphasized the cultural industries as a significant resource in creating national wealth (Kim Dae Jung, 1998a,b). On the other hand, the establishment of a cultural identity has been regarded as a significant reason for public support of the cultural industry sector. This is based on the recognition that cultural industry products are concerned with culture and the arts, which comprise cultural identity.

CONCLUSION

The article has discussed the way Korean cultural policy has dealt with the issue of cultural identity, which has been a key challenge in the evolution of Korean cultural policy. As a result,

the issue of cultural identity has affected cultural policy as a significant basis for government subsidy and as a means of regulating the cultural sector. In the process, the instrumental value of culture in terms of economic development and social cohesion has been stressed.

Due to the influence of cultural nationalism, traditional culture has been considered not only as the root of Korean cultural identity but also as a solution to the issue of cultural identity. In particular, historical factors such as Japanese colonialism, ethnic division and the indiscriminate absorption of western culture have influenced cultural identity policy. On the other hand, the purposive construction of cultural identity based on traditional culture was mobilized as a strong instrument for anti-communism, state-led economic development strategy and the political legitimacy of Park's government. Due to such an influence, from the initial stage in the evolution of cultural policy, the instrumental value of culture has become a key rationale of cultural policy.

However, the emphasis on traditional culture has faced limitations in a situation where traditional culture has lost its influence owing to the increasingly hybrid culture of contemporary society. In addition, increasing cultural exchange in an age of globalization and the international cultural industry war has also posed challenges to retaining and developing Korean cultural identity. In this respect, the scope of cultural policy for constructing cultural identity has expanded from cultural heritage and traditional arts during the 1970s to contemporary arts and the cultural life of people during the 1980s to amateur arts and popular culture and cultural industries during the 1990s.

Meanwhile, cultural identity policy has been established not only as a means of resisting cultural globalization, but also as a tool for globalizing national culture and the arts. In line with this, from the 1990 onwards, as with the economic value of culture and the arts, the reconstruction of cultural identity has provided a significant rationale for fostering cultural industries. Furthermore, the government has stressed that the establishment of cultural identity could be conducive to the international competitiveness of domestic cultural industries. This demonstrates that the issue of cultural identity has been bound up with the economic rationales of government subsidy to the cultural sector in the evolution of cultural policy.

On the other hand, the emphasis on the construction of cultural identity has also provided a rationale for regulating culture and the arts. In the process of doing so, the characteristic of traditional culture based on Confucianism, state-led nationalism, anti-communism and political and economic reasons have acted as criteria for regulation of the cultural sector. However, it should be noted that deregulation has been gradually taking place with the evolution of cultural policy.

In conclusion, in the context of cultural policy, the issue of cultural identity has been reinterpreted and mobilized differently according to changes in the political, economic, and socio-cultural environments in which cultural policy has been formulated and implemented. The issue of cultural identity remains influential in shaping cultural policy as a whole.

Works Cited

Bank of Korea, www.bok.or.kr, August 8, 2001.

Bauer, J. (2000) "Multiculturalism, cultural community: is it about culture or ethnicity? The Canadian approach", *Cultural Policy* 7(1), 77–95.

Bennett, O. (1995) "Cultural policy in the United Kingdom: collapsing rationales and the end of a tradition", *European Journal of Cultural Policy* 1.2, 199–216.

Burgi-Golub, N. (2000) "Cultural identity and political responsibility", *Cultural Policy* 7(2), 211–223.

Bradley, C.H.J. (1998) *Mrs.Thatcher's Cultural Policies : 1979–1990* (Boulder, New York).

Council of Europe (1997) *In from the Margins: A Contribution to the debate on Culture and Development in Europe* (Council of Europe, Cedex).

Eckert, C.J., Lee, Ki-baik, *et al.* (1990) *Korea Old and New: A History* (Ilchokak, Seoul).

Held, D., McGrew, A., Goldblatt, D. and Perraton, J. (1999) *Global Transformations* (Polity Press, Cambridge).

JaeHo, Chon (1998) "Nationalism and the use of history: the cultural policy for traditional culture in the Park Jung Hee regime", *The Journal of Social Science* 7, The Social Science Institute of the University of Seo Gang.

Jong, J.D. (1998) "Cultural diversity and cultural policy in the Netherlands", *Cultural Policy* 4(2), 357–387.

Keong Hyang Newspaper Company (1987) *The Fifth Republic* (Keong Hyang Newspaper Company, Seoul).

Dae Jung Kim (1998a). "Opening New Age", at the inaugural speech on the February 25, 1998.

Dae Jung Kim (1998b). "The Mutual Development of Korean Culture and Japanese Culture through promoting Cultural Exchange", from his speech at the conference with Japanese artists on the October 10, 1998.

Dae Jung Kim (1998c). "Towards the Creative Cultural State", at his speech for the Day of Culture on October 20, 1998.

Dae Jung Kim (1999). "Investment on the Cultural Sector for Future Development", at the speech for the Day of Culture on October 20, 1999.

Eling, Kim (1999) *The Politics of Cultural Policy in France* (Macmillan Press, London).

Yersu Kim (1976). *Cultural Policy in the Republic of Korea*, UNESCO.

Young Sam Kim (1995). "Culture and the Arts are a Basis for the Advanced Welfare State", in a speech at the Day of Culture on October 20, 1995.

Young Sam Kim (1996). "Building Welfare State by Culture and the Arts", in a speech at the Day of Culture on October 19, 1996.

Young Sam Kim (1997). "The Opening of Korea as a Cultural State", in a speech at the Day of Culture on October 20, 1997.

Lee, Ki-baik (1984) *A New History of Korea* (Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA).

Ministry of Culture (1990). *Ten Years Master Plan for Cultural Development*.

Ministry of Culture (1992). *Seventh Five-Year Plan for Economic and Social Development*.

Ministry of Culture and Information (1973). *First Five-Year Master Plan for Cultural Development*.

Ministry of Culture and Information (1979). *Culture and Communication for 30 years (1948–1978)*.

Ministry of Culture and Information (1981). *New Plan for Cultural Development*.

Ministry of Culture and Information (1986). *Cultural Plan in Sixth Five-Year Plan for Economic and Social Development*.

Ministry of Culture and Sports (1993). *New Five-Year Plan for Promoting Cultural Development*.

Ministry of Culture and Sports (1996). *Master Plan for Cultural Welfare*.

Ministry of Culture and Sports (1997). *Cultural Vision 2000*.

Ministry of Culture and Tourism (1998). *Plan for the Cultural Policy of the New Government*.

Ministry of Culture and Tourism (1999). *Five-Year Plan for the Development of the Cultural Industries*.

Ministry of Culture and Tourism (2000a). *White Paper on the Cultural industries*.

Ministry of Culture and Tourism (2000b). *Vision 21 for the Cultural Industries*.

Ministry of Culture and Tourism (2001). *Vision 21 for the Cultural Industries in a Digital Society*.

Ministry of Unification (1997). *White Paper on Unification*.

Ministry of Unification (2000). *White Paper on Unification*.

National Statistical Office, www.nso.go.kr, August 8, 2001.

National Unification Research Institute (1994). *A Comparative Study on the Cultural Policy of South and North Korea*, Seoul: National Unification Research Institute.

Park, Chung Hee (1968) "Modernization of man, economization of life (New Year's message for 1968)", In: Burn Shik, Shin, ed, *Major Speeches by Korea's Park Chung Hee* (Hollym Corporation, Seoul), pp 121–140.

Tae Woo Roh (1990), "Culture and Spirit of the People", in speech at the conference with artists on October 29, 1990.

Tomlinson, John (1999) *Globalization and Culture* (Polity Press, Cambridge).

Wyszomirski, M.J. (1999) "Background on cultural policies and programs in the U.S.", In: Zemans, J. and Kleingartner, A., eds, *Comparing Cultural Policy* (AltaMira Press, London), pp 113–202.

Yang, Baoyun, *et al.* (1998) "The Relevance of Confucianism Today", In: Cauquelin, ed, *Asian Values : An Encounter with Diversity* (Curzon Press, Richmond), pp 70–95.

Yeol, Oh Yang, "A Comparative Study on the cultural policy of South and North Korea" PhD dissertation paper.